



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,870	05/25/2001	Simon Paul Davis	3036/49955	2274

23911 7590 08/24/2005
CROWELL & MORING LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP
P.O. BOX 14300
WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, VAN KIM T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2151

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/864,870

Applicant(s)

DAVIS ET AL.

Examiner

Van Kim T. Nguyen

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on August 8, 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-9 and 11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 11 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 6-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to communications filed on August 8, 2005.

- Claims 1, 6-9 and added new claim 11 are pending in the case.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 1 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes et al (US 6,747,971), in view of Joo et al (US 5,963,552).

Regarding claim 1, as shown in Figures 1-10, Hughes discloses a method of operating a packet switch (200) comprising a plurality of ingress means (304a-n), a plurality of egress means (306a-n), a cross-bar (305) and a controller (314), the cross-bar being connected between the ingress means and the egress means to transfer multicast (312a-n) and unicast (313) data traffic from the ingress means to the egress means; the method comprising the steps of:

- a) determining if the data traffic to be transferred is unicast or multicast (col. 6: lines 27-30, and col. 9: lines 7-17);
- b) if the data traffic is unicast, invoking a unicast schedule (col. 9: lines 33-47);
- c) if the traffic is multicast, invoking a multicast schedule (col. 9: lines 48-63); and
- d) transferring the data traffic in accordance with the invoked schedule (cols. 2-17).

Hughes also discloses determining a priority for each ingress means for sending the cells (col. 12: lines 41-43; and col. 17: lines 56 – col. 18: line 2).

Art Unit: 2151

Hughes also discloses the priority for each ingress means is based on the combination of send opportunities (Multicast Grant Preference Pointer and Multicast Round Robin Pointer; col. 17: line 63 – col. 18: line 54).

Hughes discloses substantially all the claimed limitations, but does not explicitly call for step c) to further comprise forming a multicast cell fanout table containing current fanout requirements for a cell at the head of a multicast queue in each ingress means.

As shown in Figures 1-8, Joo teaches forming a multicast cell fanout table (22) containing current fanout requirements (MCN and VPI/VCI information) for a cell (col. 3: line 66- col. 4: line 6; and col. 4: lines 38-41).

Joo also discloses setting eligible bits (“1”) for multicast cells which are currently allowed to be scheduled (Joo: col. 5: lines 20-25).

As multicasting provides an efficient way to transmit information from point-to-multipoints, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made necessary transmitting information for a cell contained in the multicasting routing table can be used in Hughes’ crosspoint switch scheduler, motivated by the need to conserve bandwidth and improve efficiency of the communications system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Regarding claims 6-7, the combination of Hughes and Joo also discloses the step of e) filling a multicast schedule in accordance with full fanout of the first priority assigned to

Art Unit: 2151

each ingress means (Hughes: col. 17: lines 12-29; and col. 17: line 51 – col. 18: line 55).

Though the combination of Hughes and Joo does not explicitly specify a blank multicast schedule, but it is obvious the schedule must be blank before the filling since there would be no switch frame selection done yet.

Regarding claim 8, the combination of Hughes and Joo also discloses step e) further comprises the step of: (ii) filling in as much of the fanout of the next priority ingress means and subsequent ingress means as possible to complete the schedule (Hughes: col. 17: lines 30-39).

As multicasting provides an efficient way to transmit information from point-to-multipoints, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made necessary transmitting information for a cell contained in the multicasting routing table can be used in Hughes' crosspoint switch scheduler, motivated by the need to conserve bandwidth and improve efficiency of the communications system.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claim 11 is allowed.

Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

See Previous Office Action for Reason for Allowance.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed August 8, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the cited reference does not teach nor suggest "the step of determining the priority for each ingress means is based on a combination of send opportunities in the ingress means", page 7: lines 8-11, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 312 F.2d 937, 939, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

As shown above, Hughes discloses the priority for each ingress means is based on the combination of send opportunities (Multicast Grant Preference Pointer and Multicast Round Robin Pointer; col. 17: line 63 – col. 18: line 54). Cell in each of the ingress means is selected to transmit based on the combination of send opportunities, i.e., whether it is in the multicast or unicast queue and if it is in the multicast queue, whether it has a higher priority.

Granted, perhaps the combination of send opportunities of the cited reference is not exactly the same with the combination of send opportunities of the claimed invention, but since Hughes does disclose the priority of each ingress means based on the combination of priorities (send opportunities) of Multicast Grant Preference Pointer and Multicast Round Robin Pointer, it meets the claims.

Art Unit: 2151

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "*combination of send opportunities,, refers to a comparison of the relative number of sets of adjacent send opportunities, as well as the size of such sets*") are not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Van Kim T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3073. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung, can be reached on 571-272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Van Kim T. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2151

vkn


ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER